arXiv:0903.0762v2 [math.RT] 21 Jun 2009

Trivial Maximal 1-Orthogonal Subcategories For Auslander's 1-Gorenstein Algebras *†

Zhaoyong Huang‡, Xiaojin Zhang§
Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, Jiangsu Province, P. R. China

Dedicated to Professor Boxun Zhou on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday

Abstract

Let Λ be an Auslander's 1-Gorenstein Artinian algebra with global dimension two. If Λ admits a trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$, then for any indecomposable module $M \in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda$, we have that the projective dimension of M is equal to one if and only if so is its injective dimension and that M is injective if the projective dimension of M is equal to two. In this case, we further get that Λ is a tilted algebra.

1. Introduction

Iyama in [Iy1] introduced the notion of maximal n-orthogonal subcategories for Artinian algebras, and developed an extensive theory. Maximal n-orthogonal subcategories are also called $(n+1)$-cluster tilting subcategories following Keller and Reiten's terminology in [KR]. It is an interesting problem to investigate when maximal n-orthogonal subcategories (or modules) exist, because it is the setting where Iyama has developed his higher theory of almost split sequences and Auslander algebras (see [Iy1] and [Iy2] for the details). The problem of the existence of maximal n-orthogonal subcategories has been studied by several authors in [EH], [GLS], [HZ1], [HZ2], [Iy1], [Iy2], [Iy3], and so on.

Iyama proved in [Iy3] that if Λ is a finite-dimensional algebra of finite representation type with Auslander algebra Γ and $\operatorname{mod}\Gamma$ contains a maximal 1-orthogonal module, then Λ is hereditary and the injective envelope of ${}_{\Lambda}\Lambda$ is projective; furthermore, if the base field is algebraically closed, then such Λ is an upper triangular matrix ring. On the other hand, we gave in [HZ1, Corollary 3.10] a necessary and sufficient condition for judging when

---

[*] 2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 16G10, 16E10.

[†] Keywords: trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategories, Auslander's 1-Gorenstein algebras, tilted algebras, indecomposable modules, projective dimension, injective dimension.

[‡] *E-mail address*: huangzy@nju.edu.cn

[§] *E-mail address*: xiaojinzhang@sohu.com

an Auslander algebra admits a trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory in terms of the homological dimensions of simple modules as follows. For an Auslander algebra Λ with global dimension two, Λ admits a trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ if and only if any simple module $S \in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ with projective dimension two is injective. This result played an important role in studying the properties of Auslander algebras admitting a trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory. For example, by applying it, we showed in [HZ2, Corollary 4.12] the following result. Let Λ be an Auslander algebra with global dimension two. If Λ admits a trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$, then Λ is a tilted algebra of finite representation type. We also gave in [HZ2] an example to illustrate that the conditions "Λ is an Auslander algebra" and "Λ is a tilted algebra of finite representation type" in this result cannot be exchanged. In this paper, we study the existence of trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategories under a weaker condition than above, and prove the following result.

Theorem *Let Λ be an Auslander's 1-Gorenstein Artinian algebra with global dimension two. If Λ admits a trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$, then for any indecomposable module $M \in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda$, we have*

(1) The projective dimension of M is equal to one if and only if so is its injective dimension.

(2) M is injective if the projective dimension of M is equal to two.

Furthermore, we have that Λ is a tilted algebra.

Recall that an Artinian algebra Λ is called *Auslander's 1-Gorenstein* if the injective envelope of ${}_{\Lambda}\Lambda$ is projective. It was proved in [FGR, Theorem 3.7] that the notion of Auslander's 1-Gorenstein algebras is left and right symmetric, that is, Λ is Auslander's 1-Gorenstein if and only if so is Λ^{op}. Also recall that an Artinian algebra Λ is called an *Auslander algebra* if the global dimension of Λ is at most two and the first two terms in a minimal injective resolution of ${}_{\Lambda}\Lambda$ are projective. So it is trivial that an Auslander algebra is Auslander's 1-Gorenstein.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give some notions and notations and collect some preliminary results. In Section 3, we study the homological properties of simple modules and indecomposable modules over an Artinian algebra with global dimension two and admitting a trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory. As an application of the obtained properties, we prove the above theorem. At the end of this section, we give an example to illustrate this theorem.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout the paper, Λ is an Artinian algebra. We denote by $(-)^* = \mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(-,\Lambda)$ and $\mathbb{D}$ the ordinary duality, that is, $\mathbb{D} = \mathrm{Hom}_R(\ ,I^0(R/J(R)))$, where R is the center of Λ, $J(R)$ is the Jacobson radical of R and $I^0(R/J(R))$ is the injective envelope of $R/J(R)$. We use $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$ and $\mathrm{gl.dim}\,\Lambda$ to denote the category of finitely generated left Λ-modules and the global dimension of Λ, respectively. Let $M \in \mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$. We use $\mathrm{pd}_\Lambda M$ and $\mathrm{id}_\Lambda M$ to denote the projective and injective dimensions of M, respectively. We use

$$\cdots \to P_i(M) \to \cdots \to P_1(M) \to P_0(M) \to M \to 0$$

and

$$0 \to M \to I^0(M) \to I^1(M) \to \cdots \to I^i(M) \to \dots$$

to denote a minimal projective resolution and a minimal injective resolution of M, respectively. Then $P_0(M)$ and $I^0(M)$ are a projective cover and an injective envelope of M, respectively.

Lemma 2.1 ([IS, Proposition 1(3)]) *For a non-negative integer n, if $\mathrm{id}_\Lambda \Lambda = \mathrm{id}_{\Lambda^{op}} \Lambda = n$, then $\mathrm{pd}_\Lambda E = n$ for any non-zero direct summand E of $I^n(\Lambda)$.*

Lemma 2.2 ([M, Proposition 4.2]) *Assume that $\mathrm{gl.dim}\,\Lambda = n(\geq 1)$. Then for any $0 \neq M \in \mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$, the following statements are equivalent.*

(1) M has no non-zero projective direct summands and $\mathrm{Ext}^i_\Lambda(M,\Lambda) = 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.

(2) By applying the functor $(-)^*$ to a minimal projective resolution of M, the induced sequence:

$$P_0(M)^* \to P_1(M)^* \to \cdots \to P_n(M)^* \to \mathrm{Ext}^n_\Lambda(M,\Lambda) \to 0$$

is a minimal projective resolution of $\mathrm{Ext}^n_\Lambda(M,\Lambda)$ in $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda^{op}$.

Definition 2.3 ([AuR]) A homomorphism $f : M \to N$ in $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$ is said to be *left minimal* if an endomorphism $g : N \to N$ is an automorphism whenever $f = gf$. Dually, the notion of right minimal homomorphisms is defined.

The following two properties of minimal homomorphisms are useful in the rest of the paper.

Lemma 2.4 ([Au, Chapter II, Lemma 4.3]) *Let $0 \to A \xrightarrow{g} B \xrightarrow{f} C \to 0$ be a non-split exact sequence in $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$.*

(1) If C is indecomposable, then $g : A \to B$ is left minimal.

(2) If A is indecomposable, then $f : B \to C$ is right minimal.

Lemma 2.5 ([HZ2, Lemma 2.5]) *Let $0 \to A \xrightarrow{g} B \xrightarrow{f} C \to 0$ be a non-split exact sequence in $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$.*

(1) If g is left minimal, then $\operatorname{Ext}^1_\Lambda(C', A) \neq 0$ for any non-zero direct summand C' of C.

(2) If f is right minimal, then $\operatorname{Ext}^1_\Lambda(C, A') \neq 0$ for any non-zero direct summand A' of A.

The following observation is easy to verify.

Lemma 2.6 *Let $f : M \to N$ be a homomorphism in $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$.*

(1) If f is left minimal and $N = N_1 \bigoplus N_2$ with $N_1 \neq 0$, then $(1_{N_1}, 0)f \neq 0$.

(2) If f is right minimal and $M = M_1 \bigoplus M_2$ with $M_1 \neq 0$, then $f\binom{1_{M_1}}{0} \neq 0$.

Definition 2.7 ([AuR]) Let $\mathscr{C}$ be a full subcategory of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$, $M \in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ and $C \in \mathscr{C}$. The homomorphism $f : M \to C$ is said to be a *left $\mathscr{C}$-approximation* of M if $\operatorname{Hom}_\Lambda(C, C') \to \operatorname{Hom}_\Lambda(M, C') \to 0$ is exact for any $C' \in \mathscr{C}$. The subcategory $\mathscr{C}$ is said to be *covariantly finite* in $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ if every module in $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ has a left $\mathscr{C}$-approximation. The notions of *right $\mathscr{C}$-approximations* and *contravariantly finite subcategories* of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ may be defined dually. The subcategory $\mathscr{C}$ is said to be *functorially finite* in $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ if it is both covariantly finite and contravariantly finite in $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$.

The following useful lemma is due to T. Wakamatsu.

Lemma 2.8 ([AuR, Lemma 1.3]) *Let $\mathscr{C}$ be a full subcategory of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ which is closed under extensions and $D \in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda$.*

(1) If $D \xrightarrow{f} C \to Z \to 0$ is exact with f a minimal left $\mathscr{C}$-approximation of D, then $\operatorname{Ext}^1_\Lambda(Z, \mathscr{C}) = 0$.

(2) If $0 \to Z \to C \xrightarrow{f} D$ is exact with f a minimal right $\mathscr{C}$-approximation of D, then $\operatorname{Ext}^1_\Lambda(\mathscr{C}, Z) = 0$.

Let $\mathscr{C}$ be a full subcategory of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ and n a positive integer. We denote by ${}^{\perp_n}\mathscr{C} = \{X \in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda \mid \operatorname{Ext}^i_\Lambda(X, C) = 0$ for any $C \in \mathscr{C}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n\}$, and $\mathscr{C}^{\perp_n} = \{X \in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda \mid \operatorname{Ext}^i_\Lambda(C, X) = 0$ for any $C \in \mathscr{C}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n\}$.

Definition 2.9 ([Iy1]) Let $\mathscr{C}$ be a functorially finite subcategory of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$. For a positive integer n, $\mathscr{C}$ is called a *maximal n-orthogonal subcategory* of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ if $\mathscr{C} = {}^{\perp_n}\mathscr{C} = \mathscr{C}^{\perp_n}$.

From the definition above, we get easily that both Λ and $\mathbb{D}\Lambda^{op}$ are in any maximal n-orthogonal subcategory of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$. For a module $M \in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda$, we use $\operatorname{add}_\Lambda M$ to denote the subcategory of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ consisting of all modules isomorphic to direct summands of finite direct sums of copies of ${}_{\Lambda}M$. Then $\mathrm{add}_{\Lambda}(\Lambda \bigoplus \mathbb{D}\Lambda^{op})$ is contained in any maximal n-orthogonal subcategory of $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$. On the other hand, it is easy to see that if $\mathrm{add}_{\Lambda}(\Lambda \bigoplus \mathbb{D}\Lambda^{op})$ is a maximal n-orthogonal subcategory of $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$, then $\mathrm{add}_{\Lambda}(\Lambda \bigoplus \mathbb{D}\Lambda^{op})$ is the unique maximal n-orthogonal subcategory of $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$. In this case, we say that Λ admits a *trivial maximal n-orthogonal subcategory* of $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$.

Lemma 2.10 *Assume that* $\mathrm{gl.dim}\,\Lambda = n(\geq 2)$ *and* Λ *admits a maximal* $(n-1)$*-orthogonal subcategory of* $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$*. Then we have*

(1) I *is projective or* $\mathrm{pd}_{\Lambda}\, I = n$ *for any injective module* $I \in \mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$*.*

(2) P *is injective or* $\mathrm{id}_{\Lambda}\, P = n$ *for any projective module* $P \in \mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$*.*

Proof. Because Λ admits a maximal $(n-1)$-orthogonal subcategory of $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$, $\mathrm{Ext}^i_{\Lambda}(\mathbb{D}\Lambda, \Lambda) = 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. For an injective module I and a projective module P in $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$, considering a minimal projective resolution of I and a minimal injective resolution of P, respectively, then it is easy to get the assertions. $\square$

Let $\mathscr{C}$ be a full subcategory of $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$, $M \in \mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$. We use $\underline{\mathscr{C}}$ and $\overline{\mathscr{C}}$ to denote the stable subcategories of $\mathscr{C}$ modulo projective and injective modules, respectively. We use $\mathrm{Ind}\,\mathscr{C}$ to denote the subcategory of $\mathscr{C}$ consisting of indecomposable modules in $\mathscr{C}$.

Lemma 2.11 ([Iy1, Theorem 2.2.4]) *Assume that* $\mathrm{gl.dim}\,\Lambda = 2$ *and* $\mathscr{C}$ *is a maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory of* $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$*. Then we have*

(1) There exist mutually inverse equivalences $\mathbb{D}\,\mathrm{Ext}^2_{\Lambda}(-, \Lambda)$*:* $\underline{\mathscr{C}} \to \overline{\mathscr{C}}$ *and* $\mathrm{Ext}^2_{\Lambda}(\mathbb{D}-, \Lambda)$*:* $\overline{\mathscr{C}} \to \underline{\mathscr{C}}$*.*

(2) $\mathbb{D}\,\mathrm{Ext}^2_{\Lambda}(-, \Lambda)$ *gives a bijection from the non-projective objects to the non-injective objects in* $\mathrm{Ind}\,\mathscr{C}$*, and the inverse is given by* $\mathrm{Ext}^2_{\Lambda}(\mathbb{D}-, \Lambda)$*.*

We recall the definition of almost hereditary algebras from [HRS].

Definition 2.12 Λ is called an *almost hereditary algebra* if the following conditions are satisfied: (1) $\mathrm{gl.dim}\,\Lambda \leq 2$; and (2) If $X \in \mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$ is indecomposable, then either $\mathrm{id}\,{}_{\Lambda}X \leq 1$ or $\mathrm{pd}\,{}_{\Lambda}X \leq 1$.

Also recall from [HRS] that Λ is called a *quasi-tilted algebra* if $\Lambda = \mathrm{End}(T)$, where T is a tilting object in a locally finite hereditary abelian R-category. It was proved in [HRS, Chapter III, Theorem 2.3] that Λ is almost hereditary if and only if it is quasi-tilted, which implies that a tilted algebra is almost hereditary. On the other hand, it was showed in [HZ1, Theorem 3.15] that if an almost hereditary algebra Λ admits a maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory $\mathscr{C}$ of $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$, then $\mathscr{C}$ is trivial (that is, $\mathscr{C} = \mathrm{add}_{\Lambda}(\Lambda \bigoplus \mathbb{D}\Lambda^{op})$).

In the subcategory of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ consisting of indecomposable modules, we define the relation $\rightsquigarrow_0$ given by $X \rightsquigarrow_0 Y$ if $\operatorname{Hom}_\Lambda(X,Y) \neq 0$, and let $\rightsquigarrow$ be the transitive closure of this relation, that is, $X \rightsquigarrow Y$ if and only if there exists a positive integer n and a path $X = X_0 \overset{f_0}{\to} X_1 \overset{f_1}{\to} \cdots \to X_n \overset{f_n}{\to} X_{n+1} = Y$ of indecomposable modules X_i and non-zero homomorphisms $f_j : X_j \to X_{j+1}$ for any $0 \leq i \leq n+1$ and $0 \leq j \leq n$. We use $\mathcal{R}_\Lambda$ to denote the subset of indecomposable Λ-modules given by $\mathcal{R}_\Lambda = \{X$ is indecomposable in $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda|$ for all $X \rightsquigarrow Y$ we have $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda Y \leq 1\}$ (see [HRS]).

Lemma 2.13 *If Λ is an Auslander's 1-Gorenstein and almost hereditary algebra, then Λ is a tilted algebra.*

Proof. By the block theory of Artinian algebras, we can assume that Λ is connected. Since Λ is an almost hereditary algebra, all indecomposable injective Λ-modules belong to $\mathcal{R}_\Lambda$ by [HRS, Chapter II, Theorem 1.14] . Notice that Λ is an Auslander's 1-Gorenstein algebra, there exists an indecomposable projective-injective module I in $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$. So $I \in \mathcal{R}_\Lambda$. It follows from [HRS, Chapter II, Corollary 3.4] that Λ is a tilted algebra. $\square$

3. Homological dimensions of indecomposable modules

In this section, we prove the main result by studying the homological properties of simple modules and indecomposable modules over an algebra with global dimension two and admitting a trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory.

Throughout this section, assume that $\operatorname{gl.dim}\Lambda = 2$ and Λ admits a trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory $\mathscr{C}(= \operatorname{add}_\Lambda(\Lambda \bigoplus \mathbb{D}\Lambda^{op}))$ of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$. In this case, we then have that any indecomposable module in $\mathscr{C}$ is either projective or injective, and that $\operatorname{Ext}^1_\Lambda(I,P) = 0$ for any injective module I and any projective module P in $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$. In the following, we will use these facts freely.

The following lemma plays a crucial role in the proof of the main result in this paper.

Lemma 3.1 *Let $S \in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ be a non-injective simple module with $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S = 2$. Then there exists a minimal right $\mathscr{C}$-approximation of S:*

$$0 \to P \to I \to S \to 0$$

satisfying the following conditions:

(1) P is projective and $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda Q = 2$ for any indecomposable direct summand Q of P.

(2) I is injective and for any indecomposable direct summand E of I, $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda E = 2$ and E has a unique maximal submodule.

Proof. Because $\mathscr{C}(=\operatorname{add}_\Lambda(\Lambda\bigoplus\mathbb{D}\Lambda^{op}))$ is a trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$, $\mathscr{C}$ is functorially finite in $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$. Let $S\in\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ be a non-injective simple module with $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S=2$. Then there exists a minimal right $\mathscr{C}$-approximation of S:

$$0\to P\to I\to S\to 0.$$

(1) By Lemma 2.8(2), $\operatorname{Ext}^1_\Lambda(\mathscr{C},P)=0$ and $P\in\mathscr{C}^{\perp_1}(=\mathscr{C})$. So, by Lemma 2.5(2), for any indecomposable direct summand Q of P, Q is projective, but not injective. Then it follows from Lemma 2.10(2) that $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda Q=2$.

(2) Let E be any indecomposable direct summand of I such that $I=I'\bigoplus E$. Then by Lemma 2.6(2), we get the following commutative diagram with exact columns and rows:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & & \\
0 \arrow[r] & \operatorname{Ker} f\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1_{I'}\\0\end{smallmatrix}\right) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & I' \arrow[r, "f\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1_{I'}\\0\end{smallmatrix}\right)"] \arrow[d, "\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1_{I'}\\0\end{smallmatrix}\right)"] & S \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & P \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & I \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[d] & S \arrow[r] & 0 \\
 & E \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & E \arrow[d] & & \\
 & 0 & 0 & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Note that P is projective by (1). We claim that E is not projective. Otherwise, if E is projective, then $\operatorname{Ker} f\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1_{I'}\\0\end{smallmatrix}\right)$ is projective and the upper row in the above diagram is a right $\mathscr{C}$-approximation of S, which contradicts with that the middle row in the above diagram is a minimal right $\mathscr{C}$-approximation of S. The claim is proved. Then we conclude that E is injective and I is also injective. It follows from Lemma 2.10(1) that $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda E=2$.

Consider the following commutative diagram with exact columns and rows:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & & \\
0 \arrow[r] & \operatorname{Ker} f\binom{1_E}{0} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & E \arrow[r, "f\binom{1_E}{0}"] \arrow[d, "\binom{1_E}{0}"] & S \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & P \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & I \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[d] & S \arrow[r] & 0 \\
& I' \arrow[r, equal] \arrow[d] & I' \arrow[d] & & \\
& 0 & 0 & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since E is indecomposable and injective, $\operatorname{Ker} f\binom{1_E}{0}$ is indecomposable. Because P is projective by (1) and I' is not projective, the leftmost column in the above diagram is non-split and then it is a projective cover of I' by Lemma 2.4(2). It follows that $P\bigoplus P_0(E) \cong P_0(I')\bigoplus P_0(E) \cong P_0(I)$. On the other hand, we have an epimorphism $P\bigoplus P_0(S) \to I \to 0$. But $P_0(S)$ is indecomposable, $P_0(E) \cong P_0(S)$, which implies E has a unique maximal submodule. $\square$

In the following, we will give some applications of Lemma 3.1, which are needed later. We first have the following

Lemma 3.2 $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda S \leq 1$ *for any simple module* $S \in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ *with* $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S = 2$.

Proof. If there exists a simple module $S \in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ such that $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S = \operatorname{id}_\Lambda S = 2$, then by Lemma 3.1, there exists a minimal right $\mathscr{C}$-approximation of S:

$$0 \to P \xrightarrow{g} I \to S \to 0$$

with I injective. By Lemma 2.4(1), g is left minimal. So

$$0 \to P \xrightarrow{g} I \to I^0(S) \to I^1(S) \to I^2(S) \to 0$$

is a minimal injective resolution of P and hence $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda P = 3$, which contradicts with $\operatorname{gl.dim}\Lambda = 2$. $\square$

The following result is another application of Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.3 *Let* $S \in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ *be a simple module with* $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S = 2$ *and* $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda S = 1$. *Then we have the following*

(1) $\operatorname{Ext}^1_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)\in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda^{op}$ *is projective.*

(2) $\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)\in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda^{op}$ *is injective and* $\operatorname{pd}_{\Lambda^{op}}\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)=2$.

Proof. Let $S\in\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ be a simple module with $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S=2$ and $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda S=1$. By Lemma 3.1, there exists a minimal right $\mathscr{C}$-approximation of S :

$$0\to P\to I\to S\to 0$$

such that $P(\neq 0)$ is projective, I is injective without non-zero projective direct summands and $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda I=2$.

By Lemma 2.2, $0\to I^*\to P_0(I)^*\to P_1(I)^*\to P_2(I)^*\to \operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(I,\Lambda)\to 0$ is a minimal projective resolution of $\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(I,\Lambda)$ in $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda^{op}$. Because $\operatorname{gl.dim}\Lambda=2$, $I^*=0$. Then we have that $\operatorname{Ext}^1_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)\cong P^*$ is projective. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.11, we have that $\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)\cong\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(I,\Lambda)$ is injective and $\operatorname{pd}_{\Lambda^{op}}\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)=2$. □

As a consequence of Lemma 3.3 and the results obtained in Section 2, we have the following result.

Lemma 3.4 *Let* $S\in\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ *be a simple module with* $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S=2$ *and* $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda S=1$. *Then*

$$0\to\operatorname{Ext}^1_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)\to\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(I^1(S),\Lambda)\to\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(I^0(S),\Lambda)\to\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)\to 0$$

is a minimal injective resolution of $\operatorname{Ext}^1_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)$ *in* $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda^{op}$.

Proof. Let $S\in\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ be a simple module with $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S=2$ and $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda S=1$. By applying the functor $(-)^*$ to a minimal injective resolution of S, we get an exact sequence in $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda^{op}$:

$$0\to\operatorname{Ext}^1_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)\xrightarrow{\alpha}\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(I^1(S),\Lambda)\to\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(I^0(S),\Lambda)\to\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)\to 0.$$

Because $S\in\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ is simple with $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S=2$, $\operatorname{Hom}_\Lambda(S,I^2(\Lambda))\cong\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)\neq 0$ and $I^0(S)$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $I^2(\Lambda)$. Because $\operatorname{gl.dim}\Lambda=2$, $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda I^0(S)=2$ by Lemma 2.1. Then $\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(I^0(S),\Lambda)\in\operatorname{mod}\Lambda^{op}$ is indecomposable and injective by Lemma 2.11. On the other hand, $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda I^1(S)\neq 1$ by Lemma 2.10, so $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda I^1(S)=2$. In addition, by Lemma 2.5(1), $I^1(S)$ has no non-zero projective direct summands. It follows from Lemma 2.11 that $\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(I^1(S),\Lambda)\in\operatorname{mod}\Lambda^{op}$ is injective without non-zero projective direct summands.

By Lemma 3.3, $\operatorname{Ext}^1_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)$ is projective, so α is non-split. Because $\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(I^0(S),\Lambda)$ is indecomposable and injective, $\operatorname{Coker}\alpha$ is indecomposable. Then by Lemma 2.4(1), α is left minimal. Note that $\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)\in\operatorname{mod}\Lambda^{op}$ is injective by Lemma 3.2(2). The proof is finished. □

Now we can classify the simple modules over Auslander's 1-Gorenstein algebras in terms of the projective and injective dimensions of simple modules as follows.

Proposition 3.5 *Let* Λ *be an Auslander's 1-Gorenstein algebra and* $S \in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ *a simple module. Then we have*

(1) S *is injective if* $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S = 2$.

(2) $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S = 1$ *if and only if* $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda S = 1$.

Proof. (1) Let $S \in \operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ be a simple module with $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S = 2$. If S is not injective, then by Lemma 3.2, $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda S = 1$. It follows from Lemmas 3.3(1) and 3.4 that

$$0 \to \operatorname{Ext}^1_\Lambda(S,\Lambda) \to \operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(I^1(S),\Lambda) \to \operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(I^0(S),\Lambda) \to \operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(S,\Lambda) \to 0$$

is a minimal injective resolution of the projective module $\operatorname{Ext}^1_\Lambda(S,\Lambda)$ in $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda^{op}$. Because Λ is Auslander's 1-Gorenstein, $I^0(\Lambda^{op})$ is projective, which implies that $\operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(I^1(S),\Lambda)$ is also projective. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.10, $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda I^1(S) \neq 1$, so $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda I^1(S) = 2$ and hence $\operatorname{pd}_{\Lambda^{op}} \operatorname{Ext}^2_\Lambda(I^1(S),\Lambda) = 2$ by Lemma 2.11, which is a contradiction.

(2) If $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda S = 1$, then $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S \neq 2$ by (1) and S is not projective by Lemma 2.10. So $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S = 1$. Conversely, if $\operatorname{pd}_\Lambda S = 1$, then $\operatorname{id}_{\Lambda^{op}} \mathbb{D}S = 1$. Note that Λ^{op} is also Auslander's 1-Gorenstein and Λ^{op} admits a trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory of $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda^{op}$. By using an argument dual to above, we have that $\operatorname{pd}_{\Lambda^{op}} \mathbb{D}S = 1$ and $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda S = 1$. □

To prove the main result, we also need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6 *Let* Λ *be an Auslander's 1-Gorenstein algebra. If both* M *and* P *are indecomposable modules in* $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ *such that* M *is non-projective and* P *is projective with* $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda P = 2$, *then* $\operatorname{Hom}_\Lambda(M,P) = 0$.

Proof. Let both M and P be indecomposable modules in $\operatorname{mod}\Lambda$ such that M is non-projective and P is projective with $\operatorname{id}_\Lambda P = 2$. If there exists a non-zero homomorphism $f \in \operatorname{Hom}_\Lambda(M,P)$, then f is not epic. Since P is indecomposable and projective, $J(\Lambda)P$ is the unique maximal submodule of P (where $J(\Lambda)$ is the Jacobson radical of Λ) and $P/J(\Lambda)P(= S)$ is a simple module. Consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & M \arrow[dl, dashed, "f'"'] \arrow[d, "f"] & & \\
0 \arrow[r] & J(\Lambda)P \arrow[r, "i"] & P \arrow[r, "\pi"] & S \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

where i is the inclusion homomorphism and π is the natural epimorphism (which is a projective cover of S). Because $f(\neq 0)$ is not epic, there exists a non-zero homomorphism f' such that $f = if'$.

If S is projective, then $P(\cong S)$ is simple and so f is epic, which is a contradiction. If $\mathrm{pd}_{\Lambda} S = 2$, then by Proposition 3.5, S is injective and $\mathbb{D}S$ is projective. On the other hand, $\mathbb{D}\pi : \mathbb{D}S \hookrightarrow \mathbb{D}P$ is an injective envelope of $\mathbb{D}S$ and $\mathrm{pd}_{\Lambda^{op}} \mathbb{D}P = 2$, which is also a contradiction because Λ (and hence Λ^{op}) is Auslander's 1-Gorenstein. Thus we conclude that $\mathrm{pd}_{\Lambda} S = 1$. So $J(\Lambda)P$ is projective and hence the injective dimension of any indecomposable direct summand of $J(\Lambda)P$ is equal to 2 by Lemmas 2.5(2) and 2.10. Because $f' \neq 0$, there exists a non-zero indecomposable direct summand P_1 of $J(\Lambda)P$ such that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\Lambda}(M, P_1) \neq 0$. Then iterating the above process, we get an infinite descending chain of non-zero submodules of P:

$$P \supsetneqq P_1 \supsetneqq P_2 \supsetneqq \cdots,$$

which is a contradiction. The proof is finished. □

Now we are in a position to state the main result in this paper.

Theorem 3.7 *Let Λ be an Auslander's 1-Gorenstein algebra. Then for any indecomposable module $M \in \mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$, we have*

(1) $\mathrm{pd}_{\Lambda} M = 1$ *if and only if* $\mathrm{id}_{\Lambda} M = 1$.

(2) M is injective if $\mathrm{pd}_{\Lambda} M = 2$.

Proof. Let $M \in \mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$ be an indecomposable and non-projective module. We claim that $\mathrm{id}_{\Lambda} M \leq 1$. Take a minimal left $\mathscr{C}$-approximation of M:

$$0 \to M \to C_0 \to C_1 \to 0.$$

If P is a non-zero indecomposable and projective direct summand of C_0, then by Lemma 2.6(1), $\mathrm{Hom}_{\Lambda}(M, P) \neq 0$. So $\mathrm{id}_{\Lambda} P \neq 2$ by Lemma 3.6 and hence P is injective by Lemma 2.10. It follows that C_0 is injective.

If $C_1 = 0$, then $M \cong C_0$ is injective (in this case, $\mathrm{pd}_{\Lambda} M = 2$ by Lemma 2.10). Now suppose $C_1 \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.8(1), $C_1 \in {}^{\perp_1}\mathscr{C}(=\mathscr{C})$. On the other hand, C_1 has no non-zero projective direct summands by Lemma 2.5(1), so C_1 is injective and hence $\mathrm{id}_{\Lambda} M = 1$. The claim is proved.

(1) If $\mathrm{pd}_{\Lambda} M = 1$, then $\mathrm{id}_{\Lambda} M = 1$ by the above argument and Lemma 2.10. Because Λ^{op} is also Auslander's 1-Gorenstein and Λ^{op} admits a trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory of $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda^{op}$, we get dually that $\mathrm{id}_{\Lambda} M = 1$ implies $\mathrm{pd}_{\Lambda} M = 1$.

(2) By the above argument, it is easy to see that M is injective if $\mathrm{pd}_{\Lambda} M = 2$. □

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.7, we get the following result.

Theorem 3.8 *If Λ is an Auslander's 1-Gorenstein algebra, then Λ is a tilted algebra.*

Proof. If Λ is an Auslander's 1-Gorenstein algebra, then Λ is almost hereditary by Theorem 3.7. It follows from Lemma 2.13 that Λ is tilted. $\square$

At the end of this paper, we give the following example to illustrate the obtained results above.

Example 3.9 Let $n \geq 4$ and Λ be a finite-dimensional algebra given by the quiver:

$$\begin{tikzcd} 1 & 2 \arrow[l, "\alpha_1"'] & 3 \arrow[l, "\alpha_2"'] & \cdots \arrow[l, "\alpha_3"'] & n \arrow[l, "\alpha_{n-1}"'] \end{tikzcd}$$

modulo the ideal generated by $\{\alpha_1\alpha_2\cdots\alpha_{n-1}\}$. Then

(1) Λ is a tilted algebra of finite representation type, and Λ admits a trivial maximal 1-orthogonal subcategory $\mathrm{add}_\Lambda[(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n P(i))\bigoplus(\bigoplus_{i=3}^n I(i))]$ of $\mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$. Because $I^0(\Lambda)$ is projective and $\mathrm{pd}_\Lambda\, I^1(\Lambda)=2$, Λ is Auslander's 1-Gorenstein, but not an Auslander algebra.

(2) For any indecomposable module $M \in \mathrm{mod}\,\Lambda$, we have that $\mathrm{pd}_\Lambda\, M = 1$ if and only if $\mathrm{id}_\Lambda\, M = 1$ and that M is injective if $\mathrm{pd}_\Lambda\, M = 2$.

Acknowledgements The research was partially supported by the Specialized Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education (Grant No. 20060284002), NSFC (Grant No. 10771095) and NSF of Jiangsu Province of China (Grant No. BK2007517).

References

[Au] M. Auslander, *Functors and morphisms determined by objects*, in: Representation Theory of Algebras, Proc. Conf. Temple Univ., Philadelphia, PA, 1976, edited by R. Gordon, Lect. Notes in Pure and Appl. Math. **37**, Dekker, New York, 1978, pp. 1–244.

[AuR] M. Auslander and I. Reiten, *Applications of contravariantly finite subcategories.* Adv. Math. **86** (1991), 111–152.

[EH] K. Erdmann and T. Holm, *Maximal n-orthogonal modules for selfinjective algebras.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **136** (2008), 3069–3078.

[FGR] R. M. Fossum, P. A. Griffith and I. Reiten, Trivial Extensions of Abelian Categories. Lect. Notes in Math. **456**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1975.

[GLS] C. Geiss, B. Leclerc and J. Schröer, *rigid modules over preprojective algebras*, Invent. Math. **165** (2006), 589–632.

[HRS] D. Happel, I. Reiten and S. O. Smalϕ, *Tilting in Abelian categories and Quasitilted Algebras.* Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc. **575**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996.

[HZ1] X. J. Zhang and Z. Y. Huang, *The existence of maxmal n-orthogonal subcateries*. J. Algebra **321** (2009), 2829–2842.

[HZ2] X. J. Zhang and Z. Y. Huang, *Higher Auslander algebras admitting trivial maximal orthogonal subcategories*. Preprint is available at: arXiv:0903.0761.

[IS] Y. Iwanaga and H. Sato, *On Auslander's n-Gorenstein rings*. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **106** (1996), 61–76.

[Iy1] O. Iyama, *Higher-dimensional Auslander-Reiten theory on maximal orthogonal subcategories*. Adv. Math. **210** (2007), 22–50.

[Iy2] O. Iyama, *Auslander correspondence*. Adv. Math. **210** (2007), 51–82.

[Iy3] O. Iyama, *Cluster tilting for higher Auslander algebras*. Preprint is available at: arXiv:0809.4897.

[M] Y. Miyashita, *Tilting modules of finite projective dimension*. Math. Z. **193** (1986), 113–146.